

2. Claims 1-41 have been rejected under as being obvious over Miloslavsky in view of Cave. In particular, the Examiner asserts that

"Miloslavsky discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method of routing multimedia calls within an automatic call distributor system having a automatic call distributor coupled to the public switched telephone network and a host coupled to the Internet which is equivalent to an network including Internet, PSTN, ACD and multimedia data [Fig, 1, Fig 5, col 1 lines 15-20, col 2 lines 23-65]

However Miloslavsky does not detail receiving an Internet call from an Internet caller by the host through the Internet; requesting an agent assignment for handling the to Internet call from the automatic call distributor coupled to the public switched telephone network; and transferring the Internet call to a terminal of the agent assigned by the automatic call distributor.

A skilled artisan would have motivation to improve the Miloslavsky's method and looked to the prior art, which leads to the Cave's teaching. Cave taught a switching call processing wherein a the network between a plurality of remote callers connected in part over the Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) and the agent computers of selected agents assigned to said callers, said assignment enabled by the SCD according to a predetermined ACD algorithm [Cave col 9 lines 50-57]. It is clearly the calls have been transferred and received via PSTN and ACD to the assigned agent.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the technique of assigned agent fro handling the Internet call from PSTN to ACD as taught by Cave into Miloslavsky's system in order to utilize the communication of multimedia data via Internet. Doing so would provide a simplified deployment and cost effective process to handle the communication over network."

As may be best understood from the Examiner's comments, since Miloslavsky does not receive Internet

calls, the Examiner is apparently suggesting that Cave somehow receives Internet calls. However, Cave is clearly shown as being connected to an Ethernet 220 instead of the Internet. As would be well understood to those of skill in the art, the term "Ethernet" refers to a local area network (see attached definition of "Ethernet" from Newton's Telecom Dictionary (18th Ed.)). Since Cave does not use the Internet, Cave clearly does not receive Internet calls.

In addition, there is no separate host and automatic call distributor in Cave as under the claimed invention. In Cave, a switchless call distribution (SCD) resource 100 both receives and distributes the calls. For example, Cave explicitly states the "ACD application control 108 is essentially software" (Cave, col. 6, line 48). To suggest that the Cave host requests something from the Cave ACD would be to suggest that a host could request something from one of its programs. Since the Cave "ACD application control 108 is essentially software", there is no method step of (or apparatus for) "requesting an agent assignment for handling the Internet call from the automatic call distributor coupled to the public switched telephone network".

To summarize, the Examiner admits that Miloslavsky does not receive Internet calls from Internet callers through the Internet or request agent assignments for handling the Internets call from the automatic call distributor coupled to the public switched telephone network. As demonstrated above, neither does Cave. Since these elements are not taught or suggested by Miloslavsky or Cave, the combination also does not teach or suggest these two claim elements. In fact, the only source of these two claim elements would be the applicant's own

specification based upon hindsight reconstruction.

In sum, the combination of Miloslavsky and Cave does not teach each and every claim element as required by MPEP §2143.03. Since the combination of Miloslavsky and Cave does not teach each and every claim element, the rejection is believed to be improper and should be withdrawn.

3. Allowance of claims 1-41, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By 

Jon P. Christensen

Registration No. 34,137

March 11, 2003
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500